

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Claims 25-36 Comply with 35 U.S.C. §101

The Examiner found that the “article of manufacture” claims 25-36 are not directed to a tangible medium and thus not statutory as required under 35 U.S.C. §101. (Office Action, pg. 2) The Examiner suggested replacing “article of manufacture” with “computer readable medium” to overcome this rejection.

Applicants have amended claims 25-36 as the Examiner proposed to replace “article of manufacture” with “computer readable medium” to overcome this rejection.

Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection in view of these amendments the Examiner proposed.

2. Claims 1-36 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner rejected claims 1-36 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) as obvious over Graylin (U.S. App. Pub. No. 2003/0033415) and Rajarajan (U.S. App. Pub. No. 2002/00143949).

Applicants traverse.

Amended claims 1, 13, and 25 concern enabling access to workflow resource objects in a workflow engine, and requires: receiving a request, from a calling entity, for workflow resource objects of a specified type in the workflow engine, wherein the specified type of the requested resource objects comprises one of workflow objects, workflow templates and work lists defined in the workflow engine; generating a request to the workflow engine for information on available workflow resource objects of the specified type; in response to receiving the information from the workflow engine, generating a collection object including one metadata element for each workflow resource object of the specified type in the workflow engine; and returning the generated collection object to the calling entity.

Applicants amended claims 1, 13, and 25 to include the requirements of canceled claims 7, 19, and 31 that the application engine comprises a workflow engine, the resource objects comprise workflow resource objects of a specified type comprising at least one of workflow objects, workflow templates and work lists defined in the workflow engine. During the phone interview, the Examiner seemed favorably disposed to these amendments and said he would reconsider the rejection in view of these amendments. Applicants traverse the rejection with respect to the independent claims.

The Examiner cited pg. 2, para. 33 of Graylin with respect to the first two limitations of the claims, which in amended form recite receiving a request, from a calling entity, for workflow resource objects of a specified type in the workflow engine, wherein the specified type of the requested resource objects comprises one of workflow objects, workflow templates and work lists defined in the workflow engine and; generating a request to the workflow engine for information on available workflow resource objects of the specified type. (Final Office Action, pg. 2) Applicants traverse with respect to the amended limitations.

The cited pg. 2 of Graylin discusses a user preference elaborating system including an entitlement processor which receives data from and provides data to an accessor data storage, accessor group data storage and an object registry. The accessors are entities request access to objects or resources. An accessor group refers to a collection of accessors and an object registry includes individual resources associated with an entitlement expression. An entitlement expression is a specification of access entitlement and has a reference to at least one accessor group and one or more operators.

Paragraph 45, pg. 4 of Graylin further mentions that the entitlement processor receives an entitlement verification request from a client processing wishing to access a resource that includes an accessor name and an object name or ID indicating the object the client process wishes to access.

Nowhere does the above cited Graylin anywhere disclose that the entitlement processor receive a request from a calling entity, i.e., one client, for a workflow resource object and then generate a request to a workflow engine for information on available workflow resource objects, such as workflow objects, workflow templates, and workflow lists. In fact, Graylin teaches away from this requirement because Graylin mentions that the entitlement processor queries an accessor table to determine an accessor ID (see, pg. 4, para. 45). Querying the accessor ID as mentioned in Graylin does not teach or suggest the claim requirement of generating a request for information on available workflow resource objects of a specified type. Graylin further mentions querying an object registry to retrieve an object's e-expression that includes accessor names that are allowed to access a resource. (pg. 4, para. 48). Querying an object registry to determine accessors that can access a resource does not teach or suggest the claim requirement of generating a request for information on available workflow resource objects of a specified type, such as workflow objects, workflow templates, and workflow lists. Yet further, there is no disclosure in the cited Graylin of workflow objects and workflow engines as claimed.

Moreover, Applicants submit that Graylin additionally teaches away from the claim requirement of generating a request for information on available workflow resource objects of the specified type from the calling entity because the client process request to the entitlement manager of Graylin identifies the object to access. (See, pg. 4, para. 45) Thus, there is no need in Graylin to generate a request for information on available resource objects of a specified type because the request to the entitlement manager in Graylin already specifies the object to access.

Thus, the cited Graylin does not teach or suggest the amended claim requirements for which it is cited.

The Examiner cited pg. 2, para. 11 and pg. 12, para. 101 of Rajarajan as teaching the third and fourth limitations, which now recite in response to receiving the information from the workflow engine, generating a collection object including one metadata element for each workflow resource object of the specified type in the workflow engine and returning the generated collection object to the calling entity. (Final Office Action, pg. 3) Applicants traverse.

The cited pg. 2 of Rajarajan mentions maintaining a plurality of resources in a task based manner. A method receives information from resources related to tasks associated with a same type of object and stores the information from the first resource in association with the second resource. The method further receives a request to perform the management task in relation to the first managed object and determines which resource to call in response to the request.

The cited pg. 2 discusses how to store information from resources related to objects and to perform a management task with respect to a managed object. Nowhere does this cited pg. 2 anywhere teach, suggest or mention the claim requirements of in response to receiving the information from a workflow engine, generating a collection object including one metadata element for each workflow resource object of the specified type in the application engine that is returned to a calling entity requesting resource objects of a specified type. There is no teaching of a collection object as claimed in the cited pg. 2. Moreover, there is not teaching in the cited Rajarajan of generating a collection object for workflow resource objects as claimed.

The cited pg. 12 of Rajarajan mentions that a task handler address is used to generate a request that is sent to the identified resource to collect all dynamic tasks. Task information relates to functions that may be performed on a particular data object, but may not be available for objects of that type. A dynamic task may relate to a particular instance of an object. Para. 102 mentions that the dynamic tasks may be received and merged to form a task list.

Although the cited pg. 12 discusses how to collect information on tasks relating to functions performed on a particular object, nowhere does the cited pg. 12 anywhere teach or suggest generating a collection object including one metadata element for each workflow resource object of a specified type, such as workflow objects, workflow templates, and workflow lists. Applicants submit collecting information on tasks relating to functions performed on a particular object as mentioned in the cited Rajarajan does not teach or suggest the claim requirement of a collection object including a metadata element for each workflow resource object of a specified type in an workflow engine, including at least one of workflow objects, workflow templates, and workflow lists.

Thus, the cited Rajarajan does not teach or suggest the amended limitations for which it is cited.

Further, with respect to claims 7, 19, and 31, whose requirements were incorporated into amended claims 1, 13, and 25, the Examiner cited pg. 8, para. 91 of Graylin as teaching the additional requirements of these claims. (Final Office Action, pg. 5) Applicants traverse.

The cited para. 91 mentions that a client comprises any object that uses the resources of another object, such as a server object. The server objects can be accessed by client objects seeking user preference information by the invocation of preference manager methods.

Nowhere does this cited para. 91 anywhere teach or suggest a workflow engine as claimed and workflow resource objects, such as workflow objects, workflow templates and work lists defined in the workflow engine as claimed.

In the Response to Arguments, the Examiner found that the cited “accessor group” of Graylin comprises a collection object as claimed. (Final Office Action, pg. 7) Applicants traverse and submit that the cited Graylin does not teach or suggest the claimed technique for requesting information on workflow objects by generating a request to a workflow engine. Further, the cited Graylin does not teach that the accessor group comprises a collection of metadata on workflow resource objects from information on workflow resource objects of specified types received from a workflow engine.

Thus, even if one were to combine Graylin and Rajarajan as the Examiner proposes, the cited combination still does not teach or suggest the amended claim requirements for the reasons discussed above.

Accordingly, claims 1, 13, and 25 are patentable over the cited art because the cited combination does not teach or suggest all the claim requirements.

Claims 2-6, 8-12, 14-18, 20-24, 26-30, and 32-36 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from one of claims 1, 13, and 25, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above. Moreover, the below discussed dependent claims provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Applicants amended claims 3-5, 8, 10-12, 15-17, 20, 22-24, and 27-36 to change “application engine” to “workflow engine” and to change “resource object” to “workflow resource object”.

Amended claims 4, 16, and 28 depend from claims 1, 13, and 25, respectively, and further require that the workflow engine is one of a plurality of service engines enabling access to service resources, wherein the request for the workflow resource objects from the calling entity comprises a method that is a member of a service class implementation of the workflow engine, wherein each service engine provides one service class implementation of methods and objects from a same abstract service class.

The Examiner cited pg. 7, paras. 72-74 of Rajarajan as teaching the additional requirements of these claims. (Final Office Action, pg. 4) Applicants traverse.

The cited para. 72 of Rajarajan mentions that a configuration manager handles the addition of new resources and communicates with the resources and may configure the resources to allow management of those resources. The configuration manager also provides other managers information on a registered resource. The configuration manager is a web service for which web service methods are provided and other managers may use the methods to get information about the resources.

Nowhere does the above cited pg. 7 anywhere teach or suggest that the cited configuration manager is one of a plurality of service engines enabling access to service resources as claimed. Further, nowhere does the cited pg. 7 anywhere teach or suggest the claim requirement of multiple service engines, each providing one service class implementation of methods and objects from a same abstract service class. In fact, the cited pg. 7 teaches away from this requirement because pg. 7 and FIG. 3 shows only one configuration manager 330, not multiple service engines each implementing a same abstract service class as claimed.

In the Response to Arguments, the Examiner further cited pg. 3, para. 0038 of Rajarajan as teaching the additional requirements of these claims. (Final Office Action, pg. 8) The cited para. 0038 discusses how the client may communicate with a server using different protocols. Nowhere does this cited para. 0038 anywhere teach or suggest a request for workflow resource

objects that comprises a method that is a member of a service class implementations of a workflow engine, wherein each service engine provides one service class implementation from a same service object class. Applicants submit that the use of different communication protocols does not teach, suggest or concern the claim requirement of service engines providing service class implementations from a same service object class.

Accordingly, claims 4, 16, and 28 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Claims 5, 17, and 29 depend from claims 1, 13, and 25 and further require that the workflow engine and other service engines comprise workflow products from different vendors. The Examiner cited pg. 20, para. 175 of Rajarajan as teaching the additional requirements of these claims. (Final Office Action, pg. 4) Applicants traverse.

The cited pg. 20 discusses a search driven model for locating and working with objects without having to navigate through varying applications. The system provides a framework that allows an administrator to work with a specific object or group of objects. Once an object is located, the user may perform tasks associated with that object.

Nowhere does the cited pg. 20 anywhere teach or suggest multiple workflow or service engines comprising workflow products from different vendors. There is no mention of products from different vendors. Instead, the cited pg. 20 discusses a framework to allow an administrator to search and work with objects.

In the Response to Arguments, the Examiner cited pg. 16, para. 131 of Rajarajan as disclosing the claim requirement that multiple workflow engines comprise workflow products from different vendors. (Final Office Action, pg. 8) The cited para. 131 mentions that a client includes a web browser and that applet functions generate a management console in a web browser compatible with the Microsoft .Net framework. Applicants submit that functions generating a management console compatible with a specific framework does not teach, suggest or mention multiple workflow or service engines comprising workflow products from different vendors. There is no mention in the cited paragraph of workflow products from different vendors as claimed.

Accordingly, claims 5, 17, and 29 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Claims 6, 18, and 30 depend from claims 5, 17, and 29 and further require that the workflow service class implementations from different vendors each include methods and

objects from a same abstract workflow service class specifying methods and objects to include in all workflow service class implementations. The Examiner cited pg. 8, para. 95 of Graylin as teaching the additional requirements of these claims. (Final Office Action, pgs. 4-5)

The cited pg. 8 of Graylin mentions a distributed software environment based on middleware, which is connectivity software including a set of enabling services that allow multiple processes running on one or machines to interact, such as CORBA and COM/DCOM.

Nowhere does this cited pg. 8 of Graylin teach or suggest workflow service class implementations from different vendors of a same abstract workflow service class. There is no mention of a workflow service class in the cited pg. 8 nor workflow service class implementations from different vendors. Instead, the cited pg. 8 discusses middleware.

Accordingly, claims 6, 18, and 30 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

The additional dependent claims 8-12, 20-24, and 32-36 provide additional requirements that in combination with the base and dependent claims provide further grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1-6, 9-18, 20-30, and 32-36 are patentable over the art of record. Applicants have not added any claims. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0460.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: September 13, 2005

By:

David W. Victor
Registration No. 39,867

Please direct all correspondences to:

David Victor
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: 310-553-7977
Fax: 310-556-7984